

KODIAK/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY

COUNCIL MEETING

COMMUNITY CENTER

KING COVE, ALASKA

OCTOBER 6, 1995

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

MARK OLSEN (CHAIRMAN)  
ALFRED B. CRATTY  
IVAN LUKIN  
RANDY CHRISTENSEN  
THOMAS L. EVERITT

\* \* \* \*

ROBERT STOVALL, COORDINATOR  
BILL KNAUER, SPECIALIST FOR REGULATIONS  
ROBERT WILLIS, BIOLOGIST  
RACHEL MASON, ANTHROPOLOGIST  
GREG SECANIEC, BIOLOGIST

REPORTED BY: SANDRA M. MIEROP, RPR, CRR

PROCEEDINGS  
October 6, 1995

MR. OLSEN: I'd like to call the meeting back to order this morning. I'm surprised that our audience didn't show up, as they were going to help this morning on the proposal on how to harvest a few caribou, but maybe he'll show up later on today.

To the best of my knowledge, we left off at Region 3, past C & T requests; is that correct?

DR. MASON: Yes. And I'm prepared to handle that.

As we were discussing yesterday, there's a backlog of proposals, and you all received in your books the backlog that has to do with this region particularly. In the next few months we're going to be analyzing proposals for C & T, and that will fall essentially on the anthropologist to do it. And since there are only three of us working for the whole state, we need as much guidance as possible from the councils on what your priorities are for it. And looking at the C & T requests for your region, there are a few that have to do with fish, and as Bill pointed out to you yesterday, the board is not considering proposals for fish at this time. So, it would make the most sense to concentrate on the ones for brown bear and elk. And basically it boils down to those two species that are referred to in the requests, in the backlog of requests. The brown bear proposals, there's seven of them and some of them are for particular communities; others are for all of Kodiak Island. The same is true of the four elk proposals. One is for Port Lions and for Afognak, and two of them is for residents of Unit 8. What I would suggest is the council might want to consolidate each of those two sets of requests into one proposal, and have one proposal for brown bear for all of Unit 8 and one proposal for elk for all of Unit 8. As for the one for moose, it's a statewide proposal, and there aren't any moose in Unit 8. Not that I know of. So, that would probably not be considered relevant. And there's another one that is so general that it's -- it seems almost pointless almost to analyze it, and that is the first one for all introduced wildlife and fish. So, I'll turn it back over to the chairman to consider how you guys want to go about it. Do you want to create new proposals or just go through these one by one stating what you want to do with each one of them?

MR. OLSEN: Thank you, Rachel.

What is the wish of the council as to pertaining to the elk and the brown bear that I see as a reoccurring issue and concern? I guess at this time I have to accept the proposals as they are or to modify them.

DR. MASON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. One -- another point that I should make is that if the council wants to make a motion to propose, for example, brown bear for all of Unit 8, the staff can do the work of actually writing it up as a proposal. We can do that, as long as we know what your priorities are.

MR. OLSEN: I was hoping that you could fill that void. As I recall, and as these proposals take different twists, it seems to be clear to me that that is the intent of the proposals to find subsistence on elk and brown bear available to the residents of Unit 8.

DR. MASON: Yes. What our analysis would do would be to look into the available data to show that -- what customary and traditional use there had been by residents of that unit in the past.

MR. OLSEN: Since there basically hasn't been any stats on subsistence uses, it was always just a way of life, what tools do you utilize to justify?

DR. MASON: We rely heavily on harvest reports, and as you know, if there has not been any subsistence priority in the past, that could be the reason why people have not used elk, for example. So, well, we want to show that there is interest in using them and that they have used similar species -- the harvest reports for elk would go into it to show that there was interest by residents of the unit. We would also look at our species to see that there was just a general interest in using the resources of the land. And with elk we would probably look at other introduced species around the state to see how local residents have used them as part of their subsistence diet.

MR. OLSEN: When you say "the reports," I assume you're speaking of the state.

DR. MASON: ADF&G reports. That's correct.

MR. OLSEN: Again, I want to say I have some concern as it has been in the past for fear of prosecution that many, many of these animals that have been taken have not been reported.

MR. EVERITT: There have not been many, not elk that have been taken illegally, that's too hot of a critter for somebody to go over and shoot one.

MR. CRATTY: I think people -- they try to -- the way the permit system works now, mostly go to the outside people. The people around the villages, more of the people around the villages on Kodiak Island have permits than outside the island. It's a drawn permit, and by the time they open it to residents, they're spooked and hiding in the time period. It's hard to get them.

DR. MASON: We recognize that especially with respect to elk we have to look at other sources of data. Another way to approach this elk problem is through the ADF&G harvest reports, and those are taken without question about how you got it. That would get to questions of sharing and whether people had eaten elk but not necessarily hunted it, and there is no -- there is no question of the legality of the harvest or anything. So, I think that might be a more accurate source of information on the actual use of elk. We would also look at other sources of information, and I might actually rely heavily on Ivan's testimony about Port Lions residents, because that is a community that is the closest to the elk.

MR. OLSEN: Right. And as we remember that Port Lions is the aftermath of the '64 quake of the village of Afognak, and certainly the present day data, or I should say the latest data certainly isn't going to show the usage that was consumed while the village was located in the village of Afognak itself.

DR. MASON: That's right.

MR. OLSEN: When I was speaking, Tom gave rebuttal on, that is the time periods that I am looking at certainly within the past decade the fear of prosecution has a lot to do with the --

DR. MASON: I understand that.

MR. OLSEN: Robert.

MR. STOVALL: Since I'm the biologist back here, the largest amount of harvest is not a drain on federal lands. You have to be aware of that. So, any determination will probably have to take that into account. Most of the harvest is occurring on native corporation lands and/or on Raspberry Island. I think that's stated.

I'm not sure. There is a small portion of the herd that occasionally uses the refuge on the northwestern part of Afognak Island and there is a small amount of harvest there. We've got harvest records that go back about five or six years at the refuge. A number of elks harvested from the refuge portion. It averages about 10 or 12 animals a year. I don't know or have that information yet to determine whether those people who are harvesting those 12 are coming from Kodiak Island or from -- my guess is most of them are coming from off islands. I want you to keep that in mind when you do your deliberations.

MR. OLSEN: Certainly, Robert. That is a very good point. When I say that it's because I think we are trying to work with this and also support the NARC petition itself which will hopefully be the same regulation as that on federal lands. That is what the discussion has been amongst the owners, land owners on Afognak Island, not for the fact of the NARC petition, but due to the fact that everybody else is allowed to hunt the game on their lands coming down to we either get a subsistence program or nobody hunts it in a basic nutshell. I think that would create a big disturbance among the state and local residents of Unit 8, to say the least. I'm hoping that we could find a common resolution before any of this has to take place.

Ivan --

MR. LUKIN: I was thinking about -- I was thinking about the Sitka blacktail. I think they had it in the early 1900s, and likewise that was the elk. Now, whether that has anything to do with us, there being a problem with us being able to subsist the elk, I see absolutely no difference between the species. We were able to hunt the deer, I don't understand what the problem is with the elk other than the fact that it's a trophy animal which is -- I feel that is why the majority of permits are given to the outsiders. I don't feel it's right. I think that we should have priority over the trophy hunts. Subsistence users. Like Mark said here earlier, we were -- we lived in the village of Afognak and being born and raised there, I feel that we are really, you know, pushed out of what rightfully belonged to us. My feelings will be the same on the issue until it's changed to where we have to get our rights back, and I will be always one to push for those rights; and then again I see the conflict here between the state and the federal and, of course, the native land is -- we've got no choice but to obey the laws which go against our native corporation and try to bring these issues to them, and their backs are against the wall because we've got the feds and the state. Who do you listen to? Where do you go from there? Here we are, we're standing back, I could understand why there's nobody at this meeting today because these people are in a situation where they can't hunt the caribou and then I could understand what these gentlemen have to say to protect what's there, but then again where do you draw the line? People lose interest because part of their way of life is taken away from them, so why should I attend. You know, it's -- people's backs are against the wall, and in Kodiak there's no reason for it with the subsistence on the elk. There's plenty of them. I mean, I see no reason why it should be the way it is.

MR. OLSEN: Robert.

MR. STOVALL: A little biological information for the council members. The deer population was initiated on the island

around 1926. The elk population was initiated in the mid-'40s. The deer population for differences -- to show you the differences, is a lot larger on Afognak Island and on Kodiak Island than the elk population is. The numbers that I have gotten from the State's aerial surveys that they've completed put the number at around 1500 animals, and out of that 1500 they averaged about 100 to 150 animals being taken per year during the hunts. I need to get a breakdown. I'd like to get a breakdown on how many of those are Kodiak Island successful hunters versus off hunters so you have a number to work with. Those are the numbers that I've been given in the last three or four years.

MR. LUKIN: I think where I'm at on that is you're talking numbers. Subsistence should have a percent of those numbers that should be set aside for subsistence users regardless if it's ten animals or a thousand or whatever.

MR. STOVALL: That's a number that -- see, that's something that would -- that should be determined for each of the areas for all the village areas that want to have elk. It would be helpful that we know how many is needed.

MR. CRATTY: I hunted elk there for quite a few years there. Last three years I had resident hunts and haven't got an elk. After the hunters got in there, they scooped them out. You can't find them. Where you can find them, you can't get to it because of the weather. When I get a permit for them, it's no problem because they're going in and hunting them.

DR. MASON: May I make the suggestion that if the council is going to do a C & T proposal for elk, that you also do one for a season and bag limit for it so that there was some provision for subsistence use of that animal?

MR. OLSEN: Certainly the feedback that I have been getting on the subsistence elk issue is they never were a subsistence animal. I would have to say again in the same effect we shouldn't be allowed to go to the grocery store. We didn't have grocery stores either. What came first, the horse or the cart? Here again, it was an issue that was done without any recommendations from the local people of the area. Once again, it's a government decision and done.

But I just wanted to point out that I don't buy that it never was a subsistence animal. As long as there was a wildlife area that was usable, it was harvested. Unfortunately, today's customary and tradition is to go to the grocery store. I don't buy it.

Randy.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. I'd kind of like to agree with Mark on this one point. One thing I'd like to stress is that -- like you say -- like Robert was saying, that elk was introduced in the '40s and the deer were introduced in the '20s; but the fact remains that we have many children that are subsisting on these different animals, but I -- I don't like to see deer and elk lumped together as a -- I'd rather not see that. I'd like to see it as separate operations, because you're talking about a pretty wide range of area here. You're talking about quite a few different villages, six different villages, which is a pretty wide area. I would like to see deer completely different from elk as far as a subsistence resource.

And I would -- I would like to stress that there's quite a few people in the more southern regions of Kodiak Island that subsist on deer, and it's not just one generation. We're talking about almost three generations here that have been subsisting on deer. And I'd

like to see that separate from elk, completely separate. I don't want to lump them together, in my view. I'd like to address that as a different resource. And like Mark says, it's a subsistence -- depending on your C & Ts, customary and traditional, the thing about it is since the 1940s most of us here -- elk has been here -- in Kodiak, at least, since we've been born. So, we are, in a way, subsisting on it. And I think that we should address the resources that are -- even if they're introduced, there's -- if you look at Kodiak Island, about the only thing that hasn't been introduced is the bear. The fox and rabbits and everything else has been introduced. So, we should still look at it as a subsistence resource; but we should keep it separate for the different -- for the purposes of different villages and their interests. Does that make any sense? I would like to make sure that they -- that both deer and elk are separate. And once we -- once we work on the C & Ts and our resources.

MR. OLSEN: At this time, I feel the deer issue has been pretty much gone over, and we'll try to continue to modify it as time determines. But I feel at this time our issue before us, I understand -- I don't quite understand what you mean by different --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: What I'm saying is I don't want elk to bring the idea of deer down. I don't want to lump them together with deer so we're losing our resource to deer as a C & T. I believe that deer are C & T. Quite a few of these resources are introduced anyway just like rabbits or -- we have to remember is that quite a few of these things on Kodiak Island were introduced and for customary and traditional uses, we're still looking at three generations, so there's still customary and traditional.

MR. OLSEN: Point well taken. But at this time we would like to address where we are with the present proposals in place on elk and brown bear.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That was just a thought I wanted to bring up, that we --

MR. OLSEN: We have the existing proposals in place that have been tabled, and we are trying to come up with a resolution that we don't have to address each and every proposal as it is -- as it comes off the table, but to come with a final proposal that addresses all sides of --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, my thought, Mr. Chair, is that -- my thought is I really hate to see everything lumped all together.

MR. OLSEN: I don't know what you mean "lumped." We're not lumping together. I'm confused when you say "lump these together."

MR. WILLIS: I think maybe I can clear up the confusion pretty easily. Randy, there's already a subsistence priority, a C & T priority for deer on Kodiak, and any actions taken won't have any effect on that. When we speak of lumping these proposals together, we're talking about the several elk proposals that we have, not elk and deer.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. When Ivan was talking about the deer, I just got this feeling that you might be putting them together, and I want to make it clear that we're not going to hurt our harvesting of the deer, you know.

MR. WILLIS: That won't happen.

MR. STOVALL: That won't happen.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just want to make --

MR. OLSEN: Excuse me, how many proposals were there on the table for elk?

DR. MASON: Four for elk, and two of them are for Afognak Island or for Port Lions residents, and two of them are for Unit 8. What I thought is maybe you wanted to have one proposal for residents of Unit 8.

MR. OLSEN: That's what you meant by lumping together. Proposals -- four proposals, but they're on elk.

Is there any additions -- what is the pleasure of the council that's addressing these proposals as they be? It certainly is in the best interest, and I feel it will be addressed a lot sooner if we do come to a common agreement that it is the best interest to have a subsistence elk hunt for Unit 8 in this specific village.

MR. STOVALL: If I misspeak, Rachel, let me know.

If the council just wants to go ahead and make a motion to have one C & T for elk and/or one C & T for brown bear, Rachel, I think you said you'd be able to write up proposals for them?

DR. MASON: Bill will also help.

MR. STOVALL: Basically, that's all you have to do, and the process will get started.

MR. OLSEN: Yes. Thank you. That's as I understood it.

DR. MASON: Thank you.

MR. LUKIN: Can I ask one more question? I believe there was a little herd of elk started growing back in Port Lions. Are you aware of that?

MR. STOVALL: I have heard about it. I've heard it numbers between 8 and 20, and they're around the Peninsula and those areas.

MR. LUKIN: I guess the question I was going to ask you is: Did you do a survey on it? If so, what was the results?

MR. STOVALL: I don't think the survey has been done. It's off the refuge. I know the refuge didn't do any survey on it. Maybe a survey could be done. In that area, it's possible to fly it, that's for sure, just to check. You might want to make a suggestion of that to the State Fish and Game Board.

MR. OLSEN: I know about seven years ago an elk was taken off and harvested.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I was going to mention, I was going to ask you if you notice any elk down that way as far as fishing going down there and looking. There's been several incidences of people seeing elk and taking elk off of like Green Bank, Carlson Point, as far as harvested. Do you know anything about that?

MR. STOVALL: No.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: There's been reported a herd of 40 right at Carlson Point.

MR. STOVALL: They're a big animal to list. There's a lot of aerial surveys in that area.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: They're hard to miss, but there's been quite a few different people that mentioned that they see them.

MR. OLSEN: They're also easy to --

MR. WILLIS: I'd like to respond to what Ivan said, and kind of jump a bit into our proposal analysis. When the council makes a proposal or when the individual makes a proposal during the fall of the year, between now and winter meeting in February, we will

analyze that proposal and one of the things we do is collect all the information on how many elk there are, where they're located and who uses them. That information will be presented to you at the February meeting.

MR. OLSEN: On that information, here again, is this information derived by Fish and Wildlife, or is this just kind of taken off of the State reports, because they're conflicting --

MR. WILLIS: It's everything that's available, Mark, and we don't take any of it at face value. We get everything and look at it to make our own independent analysis.

MR. OLSEN: That's what I like to hear.

MR. KNAUER: One thing that will be very important to consider at that time is to keep in mind that that will apply only to federal lands and whatever the practice of harvest has been to take the animals on federal lands. Just because the animals -- there's a lot of animals on the Afognak and there's been harvests it may or may not reflect that they -- that they've been customarily taken off of federal lands. So, that will be something at your February meeting that will need to be kept in mind.

MR. OLSEN: I think it will be some subsistence rights from the State. That's what the hopes are.

MR. LUKIN: If we don't do everything under one roof here, then we're going to have to get here and fence off federal lands and put animals in these lands.

MR. CRATTY: Look on there, where the federal lands are is not where you're talking about. It's a State issue too.

MR. OLSEN: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. CRATTY: The elk is on federal lands.

MR. OLSEN: Maybe you might be able to help me. This land purchase that's being bought by the native corporations, how is that going to be addressed? Would it be federal public lands?

MR. STOVALL: Yes. Any of the lands, they are bought back with the knowledge that they are federal public lands and they have the subsistence priority. We'll keep that in mind. Any future purchases that we have, same thing, same way.

MR. OLSEN: Anymore discussion about these C & T requests? If not, I hope to entertain a motion to clarify this and maybe give some clearer direction of our intent on this.

Well, I guess I can move to have these proposals all brought under the hopes of having a subsistence hunt for the residents of Unit 8 is what you -- yes.

MR. KNAUER: To clarify for my mind, are you proposing that, for example, brown bear, the C & T determination would read: Brown bear, Unit 8, residents of Unit 8? Is that your proposal like for brown bear? And would your proposal for elk read: Elk, Unit 8, residents of Unit 8?

MR. OLSEN: Yes.

MR. KNAUER: Thank you. That helps me.

MR. OLSEN: That's all we have in Kodiak is one game management unit, as far as I know.

Is there any second on that motion?

MR. LUKIN: Second.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Discussion? Mr. Chair, the reason I've been kind of quiet on this one here is I'm still a little bit in the dark on this one here. On that customary and traditional for the



proposals. I'm just -- of course, being from down in Larsen Bay, we don't see a lot of elk down there other than what I was just speaking about, but I haven't personally seen any. Of course, we see a lot of brown bear. I guess I'm going to go ahead and say "aye" on this one here, but I'm going to go along with the council, I suppose. That's the only thing I want to say, and that's the reason why, is just because I'm going to go along with the council.

MR. OLSEN: I think we'd certainly like to air out anything that's questionable or misunderstood or not clear to you.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yeah. Well, we're still working on the customary and traditional.

MR. OLSEN: Absolutely.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Before that can be hashed out, I hate to just say "yes," but I am going to go with the council on this one.

MR. OLSEN: Maybe I can, once again, shed a little light, that these have been C & T proposals. Since there have been no proposal on C & T, they are tabled, they're on the table, and hopefully now that C & T has been established as a guideline, then now maybe these proposals can move ahead. But in the meantime, over the years, these proposals have started stacking up. Now we're trying to revisit these issues on the table since C & T has determination. Now we need to try to clarify where -- how can we fit all these proposals to come up with one that's going to work.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I can't fully justify saying "aye" until the C & Ts are -- I don't want to say "yes" to something that's not quite concrete, you know, etched in granite.

MR. KNAUER: Two things. First off, right now all you're doing is putting a proposal on the table. We recognize that you don't have the analysis and the facts regarding this proposal. If you do vote to accept it, we would come back to you in February with the analysis and you'd have a chance to look at it thoroughly and vote on a recommendation at that time.

Secondly, in order to have any sort of a hunting season, subsistence season, there are two requirements: First, a community must be rural; and, secondly, there must be a C & T determination that the community or area has a history or a tradition of harvesting that species in that area. Those two requirements are necessary before there can be a season. We already know that the communities in Unit 8 are rural. That determination has been made by the board. So, this is the second step to determine whether or not there has been a history of use of these species in that area. Now, to determine whether there has been or not, there needs to be a proposal so that the staff can accumulate the data and look at it. It may be that there have not been. That's acceptable. That doesn't mean that you're prohibited from hunting them. That just means that the harvesting will be under the regulations. At this point, nothing is prejudicial as far as a determination.

MR. OLSEN: Yes, Rachel.

DR. MASON: I don't know if this will shed more light or darkness. I'd like to respond to Randy and follow up on what Bill was saying. You're saying that people in Larsen Bay might not have used elk in the past. That might come out in the analysis. Perhaps there are some parts of Unit 8 or some communities that don't have customary and traditional use of it. But the reason the proposal is consolidated is because, as Mark said, there has been this whole

backlog of individual C & T requests, and the way we were doing C & T before was that the whole region would be considered together, all species, all communities in the region, and if we were going to wait for Kodiak to come up in that one, it would be years down the trail.

So, this gets them up on the table faster to have the individual species, even though it -- for all of Unit 8, rather than just the northern communities.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you.

MR. OLSEN: I didn't mean to say that by the determination. The process identified for the determination.

MR. LUKIN: I was going to remind Bill that when you do your survey or whatever on those two issues, the second part of your issue was to determine whether or not we qualify by past harvests. I would like to bring up, again, what Al said earlier. Once the first hunt is -- has been through, it puts us in the second and third hunts, really hard to catch game, especially elk. I got tags last year, and it was either on the second or third hunt. And in the same area that three or four elk was shot in the first hunt, there was absolutely nothing in that area, which if you go from one end to the other to fill these tags, they were gone. So, I hope that you remember the fact when you do that second survey that you take into consideration that a lot of this is part of the problem why there isn't another tag filled.

MR. KNAUER: One of the things in looking at the information is they not only look at the harvest, but they look at where the permits are gotten. And, you know, it may be that a community hunts regularly, but because they're going for the second or third hunt, they're not successful. So, the information that there is hunting occurring is every bit as important as whether or not there's harvesting occurring.

MR. OLSEN: When I look at how we determined these issues, I would just like to give an example -- let's say, for students going to school, they have to fill out an application, they're trying to get money for school, after awarding them these grants is the need. It was brought out that just by filling out the application, basically shows the need. Would this be similar to those that have gotten the elk tag and were unsuccessful? Would that be part of the population that we -- the people have been attempting?

MR. KNAUER: Yes.

MR. CRATTY: On the bear issue, when you determine on that, I think basically what they're looking at now in Old Harbor is maybe harvesting one bear for the older people or something. They're not going to go out and harvest a bunch of them. It's just --

MR. OLSEN: Opportunity.

MR. CRATTY: -- give the old people what they used to have. Growing up with my grandma, we used to eat salt bear all the time when I was young. That's something you could take into consideration there. You ain't going to be harvesting a bunch of bear for subsistence use; it would be one bear.

MR. KNAUER: That's something that you would consider for a proposal for a seasonal limit. That would be the next step.

MR. STOVALL: I understand that they should do both -- I mean, should they also do -- along with the C & T determination, they should also go ahead and put in a proposal for a bag and season limit for the species too.

MR. KNAUER: They can do that now and also determine

what the final determination is for C & T. That will put it down one year down the line as far as a season if they're successful. It would be appropriate to propose a season and harvest limit whether it's on a community basis like Al mentioned, like maybe one bear in the community or two bears in the community, or whether it would be on an individual basis, whichever may be more appropriate.

MR. OLSEN: Was that basically --

MR. WILLIS: That's exactly what I was going to say.

MR. OLSEN: Okay. Anymore discussion on this motion? Moved? Seconded? Questions?

MR. STOVALL: Could I have the motion read back?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I was going to have the motion read back. Can I rehear the motion?

MR. KNAUER: What I have written down, based on the discussion from Mr. Olsen, was that the motion was to have one proposal for customary and traditional use for brown bear for Unit 8, for residents of Unit 8, and the second proposal would be a C & T determination for elk in Unit 8 for residents of Unit 8.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, going back to what Al was talking about, on the bear, do you think that going before the board it would be better to add something about a bag limit, like, say, maybe one, two, three bears per village and how flexible is that going to be, because it may be easier to get it approved more, you know.

MR. OLSEN: It would not be rejected for lack of --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: For the lack of being too vague.

MR. KNAUER: You want to put that in another proposal.

In other words, you would want to -- if this council adopts that proposal for bear, that's the C & T, then you would have a second proposal that would say brown bear in Unit 8, I don't know, we'll say October 25th to May 1st. One bear for each community of Larsen Bay, Old Harbor, Port Lions, that would be one. But that would be a separate proposal from the other.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, can we -- can we do this on -- at the same time? Do we have to do another proposal now on that motion, make a move on that one?

MR. OLSEN: Yes, that's what it would take, another motion, but I feel this might be pushing us a little too quick in making decisions and assumptions on our own right here at this point.

I just think a little more research would be a lot healthier for the determination.

DR. MASON: Mr. Chairman, the season and bag limit would be based on the C & T. So, you'd first have to have the C & T proposal, then ask for a season and bag limit, and you can do that today too, submit it at the same time, but the basis of it is the C & T.

MR. OLSEN: I think it's very crucial, when we look at our season/bag limit, that we have it as the need rather than just to get the issue through.

Yes.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, I was going to also point out if you feel comfortable that you know what kind of season and bag limit that you want for these communities and species, you can do it today. If you don't feel comfortable and would rather go back home, get more information, talk with more people, then you don't necessarily-- don't have to do a season and bag limit today. The

difference is that if you recommend the proposal for C & T and the board approves that, that would go into effect for next year, but there would be no season/bag limit for next year. If you want a season/bag limit for next fall or for the spring, then you would have to set one -- recommend one today so it can be analyzed and presented to the board in April.

DR. MASON: It wouldn't have to be today. It could be anytime between now and the 27th of October.

MR. WILLIS: That's another option, if you want to go ahead and do the C & T, you've got about three weeks to think about what the season/bag should be and submit another proposal. You can also do that.

MR. CRATTY: On the elk, I don't know if you want to put a bag -- I don't know if you -- I don't know if you had to, if you wanted to put a bag limit if it was going to be a subsistence issue. I know I want to come up and hunt elk subsistencely too. How can you --

MR. OLSEN: We're talking about season and bag limit. Is it going to be individual or community? When we talk about bag limits, we're not talking about one, two, three animals per person. I'm certain that we're not going to be more than one for subsistence user at the maximum because of herd size and health. But I think the bag limit is concerning whether we're going to have individual --

MR. CRATTY: I think on the bear, I don't think there would be a problem on that; but the elk, I think it might be --

MR. LUKIN: On the elk issue, let's say we were allowed 25 elk or whatever, we know how many members in our community and yours and Randy's and everybody else that's going to be involved in -- your chances of -- I mean, your tags will go to a local which if they're in the pool, in the state pool, you don't know where it will go. The chances -- we know 25 elk are going to come to us.

MR. CRATTY: And the whole deal is a half an elk is enough for a family for a winter.

MR. OLSEN: I have a question here -- I just lost my train of thought. When we're talking bag limit, I would like to, at this time, unless they're going for community harvest, that would be one reason to address the number of animals per community per se. I think that should be left open as for, No. 1, the individual because some other hunters from different communities might be successful where others aren't. That won't close off the opportunity. Also, elk being a big animal, there's not -- I don't know of too many harvesters that take a whole elk and do not share it, take it home and put it in their own freezer. It is an animal that is traditionally shared amongst the village people.

Anyway, we are still on this motion on the floor. Moved and seconded. Anymore discussion?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Question.

MR. OLSEN: Question is being chaired. All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

COUNCIL IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. OLSEN: Against?

What should the bag limit be at this time?

MR. CRATTY: I think we could on bear, but I think on elk we should, like you were saying --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, I'd like to just table this discussion until after we get back to our respective villages

and find out what the views of the people are as far as one or two bears or three bears or as far as whatever elk is. I think we should -- as far as this next proposal, I think it would be best -- I don't believe that right now we should decide on what we're going to propose on how many as far as a bag limit or whether it's community or individual. I'd rather just wait until our next meeting. I think we could put that on our agenda for the next meeting.

MR. OLSEN: On the other hand, I look at this as being discussed here, without a season/bag limit we are talking about a whole other year before action is taken. My intention is I don't want to speak for my own self at all. There are people that have put these proposals in. I think we should at least make the effort to contact them to find out what's on their mind to make a decision.

MR. STOVALL: I did contact -- this is still on the C & T determination, this table here. I did contact all of them, and they all wanted us to try and proceed with their proposals as they put them in. We basically have done that by voting on the C & T determinations. Above and beyond is the season and bag limits, and it's not a bad idea to go back and get more input from your villages; but if you feel you have enough of it already to -- it's also not a bad idea to make that proposal so that you have an opportunity to get it started next year. Otherwise, you're talking 1997-'98 on the seasons before it could take effect.

MR. KNAUER: The other thing you can do is you can go back and talk to your community and take one of the proposal forms and fill it out for -- take a look at the federal book and take a look at the state book and write yourself out a season harvest limit that looks like that and send it in before October 27th, get it to Robert or fax it to our office so that that is another option, if you want to go back and talk to your folks in your community and determine whether they feel it would be more appropriate to have a community limit or an individual limit.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair --

MR. WILLIS: That's what I was going to say.

DR. MASON: I was going to say that. Randy was thinking along those lines.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just wanted to just kind of expound on what he was saying is that, you know, I don't want to set a proposal for one bear, two bear, and I go home and all of a sudden there's different people are saying how come only this, how come this? I'd rather go home and talk with people first so I have something that my community will agree with me on what I say, am trying to say here.

MR. OLSEN: I wanted to avoid any conflict, say, if we had bear in the community, I don't quite understand how that would work. It might be that we only got two bears for the community, we better go out. I don't want any conflict on the proposal.

MR. CRATTY: I think if you go and say you can take more than two bear out, they ain't going to give it to you. They're going to say more. I can see going back and asking the people on the elk.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That's another thing.

MR. CRATTY: I think we should just go ahead and do what Bill said and all come back and find out what the people really want.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, another thing I'd like to

stress to the council too is that we've got to keep in mind that bear -- they're -- it's pretty widely known throughout the whole United States, so you got to keep in mind when you're making these proposals that, you know, you can ask for 15 bear. It's true that people do like bear meat, but you can ask for too much. I'd like to still stress when making these proposals, you've got to make it viable to the board so that they will give you what you want and then still make them happy too.

MR. OLSEN: Certainly, this is under C & T --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just wanted to stress that to the council.

MR. OLSEN: I believe that ours is going to be in line with the C & T also.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just wanted to throw that point out. I suppose that can't be stressed too much.

MR. OLSEN: One more thing.

Al.

MR. CRATTY: How would you go back and discuss the elk with the community? How would you present it? "We're going to have a subsistence hunt; how many elk do you feel we should take?"

MR. OLSEN: I believe it would be in order to notify your community, whatever it be by bulletin, by radio, by newspaper that we had a proposal for C & T on elk and brown bear. At this time, we are seeking information as to what the community would like to see as far as season/bag limits. Get some feedback, what the general consensus of your community is, when is customary and traditional time that they -- most of them hunt bear or elk and how many are taken in the past. I guess that's my feeling of what I'm trying to find is if we get no feedback from the people, I guess we take it upon our own shoulders, but it is a known fact that they are a utilized animal.

I guess we've reached enough consensus on what we need to do. I guess we ought to go ahead and wait for a response, and I would hope that these responses will get back to us before the end -- before the deadline of our meeting in November --

MR. CRATTY: October 26th --

MR. WILLIS: October 27th.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, do I understand now we could just contact Moses or who would we contact about what we've been speaking about?

DR. MASON: I invite anybody to call me at this toll-free number or call Robert Willis. Moses is getting back on October 27th. I don't think he'll be much help. Robert is your coordinator until then.

MR. STOVALL: I might have missed something here.

DR. MASON: Help with the proposal.

MR. STOVALL: Okay. I know exactly what it was I wanted to say. I suggest, especially if you want to make a proposal on brown bear, that you do contact, at the minimum, the refuge. They have a lot of the information that you would want to have in making your proposal, and that can be done next week, the week following, and in time for you to make up a good proposal. I'd be willing -- I'm there. I've got the information in my hands, and I can help you with that proposal, if you'd like, without any problem at all, in time for you to get it in by October 27th.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: What I was specifically talking

about was basically just a bag limit. The proposal is fine with me.

It's just a bag limit itself that I wanted to get more information on, like --

MR. STOVALL: Suggested bag limits.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'd rather get more information from my village -- my villages.

MR. STOVALL: It would be good if you came up with those -- if you got that information back to me, and I can --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'd rather not say a certain number right now.

MR. STOVALL: That's fine.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'm also representing others too who take bear.

MR. STOVALL: Right, right.

MR. CRATTY: I think on the hunt issue, I know the people around Old Harbor, if they're given a chance to subsistence hunt, they like to do it later in the fall or early in the spring.

MR. STOVALL: Late in the fall or early in the spring.

MR. OLSEN: I'd also like to speak on behalf of elk as being a large animal, I know my father had been in the guiding business for bear and elk for years, but traditionally we had always tried to get our elk after the cold had set in, snow, as it was a factor in reducing meat spoilage.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, I hate to keep going on here, but another question I have, is this just for Unit 8? What's happening with the bear down here? We're not concerned about that now?

MR. OLSEN: Our proposal right now is in Unit 8 by the residents of Unit 8.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just wanted to clear that up. That's all.

MR. WILLIS: We have no C & T proposals for brown bear down here in Unit 9.

DR. MASON: Nobody has entered a proposal.

MR. EVERITT: I doubt if they know anything about doing a proposal.

DR. MASON: That would be good to get some local input.

MR. OLSEN: Their concern is how do we do this? I certainly encouraged them to just at least get a basic down of what their desire or unity is. Please get that and sign it and get it to one of us that would be able to process it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: The feeling I get from down here is that nobody bothers, is they just do whatever they want to. Nobody bothers them. So --

MR. OLSEN: That's supposed to be kept quiet.

MR. KNAUER: That is not uncommon around the state.

MR. LUKIN: I would like to add to what we're talking about times -- spring, fall or whatever on the hunts, I'd like to add that the elk on what Mark proposed about the later hunt, my feelings are I personally go for the quality of the meat. My concern in fall, you get a much better tasting steak than you do later on in December.

We don't have the problems anymore with freezers or keeping food fresh like we did in the past. So, I would prefer to stay with the best quality meat which would be in the fall.

MR. STOVALL: Fall, early fall.

MR. LUKIN: In early fall.

MR. CRATTY: September.

MR. STOVALL: Is it safe to assume that a proposal is out on the table to gather information for making bags and seasons for brown bear and elk, both?

MR. OLSEN: Yes.

Okay. I think we are ready to move on. I'd like to now move on to discuss the development of regulations. Who would like to give their --

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, I'll be starting out with that. We have a new form for submitting proposed changes in the regulations this year in your books. You'll see a yellow construction sheet like this followed by the actual form itself which is in white that's also in there (indicating). There's a sample of a proposal to change the subsistence regulations, and the way the form is different is that this year, instead of just doing seasons and bag limits under subpart B, we're now doing the C & T determinations on here, which is on the same form. This is the form that you would use whether you were in -- requesting a change in the customary, traditional use determination or a specific season for a species. The sample that you have there is one that we had come in from the Southcentral Region last year, which is a real good one. I added a few things to it to make it complete. The two things that we still stress are detail and information. We're getting better at this. We're getting better proposals. This council has been through this two years now, so you know what it takes to make a good proposal. Robert has been a big help in getting the designated hunter proposal in the proper form. There's two things that I want to stress in filling out these forms to submit proposals for changes and regulations. No. 1, write in the regulation that you want changed exactly the way it is in the book, and then, No. 2, write in the regulation exactly the way you want it changed. That is, if it's only a change in season date, like in the sample here, there was a request to extend caribou season from September 20 to September 30, question No. 1, which proposal -- which regulation do you want changed? You wrote in a regulation just like it was in the book. Question No. 2, how do you want it changed? Wrote in the same thing with the change in it. The only difference being an extra ten days in the season. That, if it's done that way, then we don't have to try to interpret what the person is really after. If you just say I think the moose season should be longer or I think we ought to be able to hunt brown bears in December instead of having to quit in November, that doesn't tell us a whole lot. We try to interpret or get back to the person who made the request to get more specific. That's the first thing is always write down the regulation you want changed as it is and exactly the way you want it changed. The second thing I want to stress is getting as much information as possible on the species that you're concerned with. There's almost no place in the state where a person wants to change the regulation, doesn't have access to either a refuge office, national park office, State Fish and Game office, somebody locally in the area that the regulation affects that can give you a lot of good information which will help you draft the regulation the way you want it. Robert just mentioned refuge, contacting the refuge about how many brown bears would be a perfect example. This sample here, there's quite a bit of information on the caribou herd and what it's been doing the last few



years and what the projections are and all that information is available just by picking up the telephone or by walking in the Fish and Game office right in the area where this proposal is made. So, as far as the change of the season and bag limits that goes there, those are the things that we stress in submitting the proposals.

MR. KNAUER: One thing to add. In many cases for a species, there are multiple seasons, there might be a spring and fall season or a fall and a winter season. For example, if you want the fall season lengthened and you write down the extra days you want the additional date, maybe you want it instead of ending November 1, you want it to end November 15th. Then you don't write down the December season that occurs. We don't know whether you mean to say you'd rather have those extra days in November and not have a December season or whether you just forgot to put the December season down there. So, it's very important if there are two different seasons that -- and you're only talking about one, that you still list the other one the way it was if you want changes, because it's hard for us to interpret it.

MR. WILLIS: That's what I was referring to when I said always write down the regulation exactly as it is and exactly the way you want it to read. Just change the parts you want changed. Don't leave anything out.

MR. OLSEN: At the present, what is the justification for most of our big game only being open up to December 31st of present year? It seems that's kind of been all my life all the seasons have -- on big game such as elk, deer, et cetera, unbeknownst to me, it just seems like it's a number pulled out of a hat. I haven't heard any biological reasoning as to why. And it's been very hard to get anything extended beyond that because such precedent has been set for the last three decades on that. Help me.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Could they be denning for the winter?

MR. KNAUER: If you look at the seasons -- if you look at in the book, there are seasons that close as early as in September and various seasons in various parts of the state close throughout the time. There is no magic date of December 31. So, it all depends on the individual species and the individual area, how much pressure that herd can stand and how much harvest that herd can stand.

MR. OLSEN: I'm being aware, only on superb allocations when we've had big abundances of bear in the harsh winter, have they extended the season in January, but that has been twice in the last three decades. I just wanted to hear, shed a little bit of light as to where they come up with that.

MR. WILLIS: Rachel, did you have anything to add as far as C & T?

DR. MASON: I don't want to belabor it, but I just wanted to emphasize that in the questions that have to do with customary and traditional use, as full information as the proposer can provide is very helpful, and there are questions asking what seasons was this traditionally harvested, where was it traditionally harvested, and one thing that isn't pointed out on here, but would be a good thing to include is if there has been some reason out of your control or out of the harvester's control why it wasn't harvested in the past, that should be included here, whether it was because of regulation or because they weren't available until a certain date, that would be something that we need to include in our analysis. And

there's also an example of a C & T proposal in here that you could use as a model for proposals.

MR. STOVALL: I've got a question for Robert. If, for instance, we're at a point where right now we're thinking of writing proposals that aren't already in the book, should that -- underneath existing regulation, there would be just no --

MR. WILLIS: Just a statement to the effect that there is no existent regulation would be sufficient there.

MR. STOVALL: Okay.

MR. OLSEN: Anymore discussion on the proposal form and review?

Hearing none, I would move on to development proposals to change subpart D. I think I would like to, if somebody would elaborate to those that do not understand what exactly is subpart D.

I don't know if our new members or existing members understand subpart D.

DR. MASON: Subpart D proposals are the ones to change season and bag limits. That's what you just finished discussing.

MR. OLSEN: Sometimes better in plain, old --

DR. MASON: In English.

MR. STOVALL: It sounds like for this one, this is where you want to have your discussion that you already more or less had during the C & T portion on what type of proposals you would want to have developed for the coming year, and it sounded like that you were going to get back -- that you wanted to come up with some type of proposal for bear and elk, and that you are going to get -- go to your respective villages and discuss it and then come back with information that would be put into a proposal form.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Before the 27th?

MR. STOVALL: Before October 27th. And that's for both bear and elk.

MR. OLSEN: Okay. Individual proposals by both determination.

MR. STOVALL: Season and bags, it will be new seasons and bags.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: You say both bear and elk? Is that what you said?

MR. STOVALL: Yeah. Okay.

MR. OLSEN: I guess that's pretty -- should be pretty clear. Any questions that we have on development of proposals?

Hearing none, I think I'd like to call for a ten-minute recess.

(Short break.)

MR. OLSEN: We'll call this meeting back in session, please.

We are under 8, new business F, other business to come before the regional council. Regional council member to attend BBRAC regional council meeting to discuss boundary change. I know that I have been contacted on this issue. At that time, I had responded -- I didn't know if I had the time since my other duties and representations required a lot of me this month. At that time, I had requested -- from Mr. Dirks and Mr. Stovall, and I was hoping that Vince Tutiakoff would be able to represent the issue. To my knowledge, at this time, Mr. Tutiakoff has not been able to be

reached. Would you like to tell us more on that, please, Robert, please, Stovall?

MR. STOVALL: I think that the council should decide whether they want to pursue the boundary change, and if they do decide they want to pursue it, then there should be -- should be a representative of the council go to the meeting to discuss it. If they decide that they don't want to pursue it, then I think you'd be able to -- Helda said, Helda is the regional coordinator for the Bristol Bay Regional Council. She said that maybe just input would be good enough if that was the case. So, Vincent was the primary push for the change, and I think -- the best -- the best possible way to answer this is for him to go to that meeting; and we've been unable to reach him. If we could get his input, I don't know whether that would be possible.

DR. MASON: Mr. Chairman, maybe for the new members' benefit it would be good to enlighten them on what the issue is. It was the community of Port Moller that was going to be added. And Vince was going to do a little further research on whether the people in Port Moller actually wanted to be included. And as I understood it, he was unable to find anyone there that could give an opinion -- that was a year-around resident in Port Moller that would give an opinion as to whether they wanted to be included with us or with the Bristol Bay Council. I thought that the issue was kind of a dead issue.

MR. OLSEN: I, myself, as I recall, back when this proposal was made, it certainly had a lot of good validity to it without my point of view, that -- I would certainly hate to see a boundary line between Ouzinkie and Port Lions, for general purposes.

There was other reasoning beyond it that certainly made good sense to me and the council, and I feel that at that time, why, we did take the time to give it some good thoughtful concern. Yes, as I recall, that was the case at issue, and that's why I had responded back that I thought it would be best for Vincent to be there. Second of all, I'd like to know, when is this meeting? Is it not this coming week?

Next week at the same time, basically?

MR. STOVALL: Next week on the 12th or 13th and 14th is the Bristol Bay meeting, and the 13th, which is next Wednesday, is when they were planning on discussing the boundary change on their agenda.

DR. MASON: Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday next week is the meeting.

MR. STOVALL: I think it's Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

MR. OLSEN: I believe this is to be held in Billingham?

MR. STOVALL: Billingham. I just wanted to make -- that the community of Port Moller, if, indeed, there are people there, would be still represented by the Bristol Bay Council if there was no change in the boundary. So, it's not like people living in that particular area would not be represented on a subsistence regional advisory council. They would have representation from Bristol Bay if we did nothing to change that.

MR. KNAUER: And the other thing is there are no regulations that are based on regional boundaries. Okay? So, the only thing that is of any significance is which council they are represented by.

MR. OLSEN: At this time, I would say, just to follow up on it more, maybe Robert, between yourself and I could make a few phone calls to at least make an attempt to see if this is still an issue as to either Port Moller or Vincent has anymore information on. Is it still an issue to be kept alive? If we do not get any response, then I feel then that it's basically a waste of my time or our time to pursue it.

MR. STOVALL: I agree.

MR. OLSEN: Anything more on the boundary line change? Any questions?

MR. LUKIN: On that last -- this, Vince, I guess, was supposed to talk to Bristol Bay; isn't that correct?

MR. OLSEN: Well, he was going to bring us back the desires of the people involved in the boundary line change. That was the basis that -- information that we were waiting to receive to -- as a council to make a determination. Whether it was in the best interest of us or Port Moller or either, it was definitely brought in by the council members of -- representing -- from this region. I won't say represented region, as we all do.

No other questions? I would like to move on to regional council member training. Who can enlighten us on this?

MR. STOVALL: The subsistence -- help me out here -- there is an idea that the council members would have liked some type of training, be it biological or anthropological training to determine more information in the use of biological and anthropological facts that is being developed and that you use in your deliberations for making proposals. I guess the question is what the council feels they need to have more training in and how we would go about getting that training for you.

MR. OLSEN: My personal feeling is you cannot have too much training. I always hunger for education. I certainly would support any training that might be available to our council.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, we have had a number of requests for how our biological analyses are done, things we look at.

So, for next fall we plan to have a booklet of basic wildlife principles and techniques available for all council members. I thought I would point that out. We had talked earlier about having to have a short course or presentation at the council meetings, we thought it would be much better to put this in a booklet form for people to take home with them and study it at their leisure and we would also have something to give your new council members and new coordinators as they came on board.

MR. STOVALL: Was there something similar from the socio- anthropological --

DR. MASON: There hasn't been any request for that yet, although we would be happy to provide some kind of training, if the council thinks it's necessary.

MR. STOVALL: I might bring this up, and I don't know how much the council is aware of it, but there is a -- I thought it was very interesting at one of the regional coordinators' meeting was a traditional and environmental knowledge that is being used as an information source to help with some areas in Alaska to develop proposals along councils or with working with missions, commissions, sea otter, sea lion commissions. Traditional environmental knowledge, from my understanding, is basically knowledge from elders and from those who have been observing and keeping track of wildlife

populations, fishery activities and motions throughout their villages and/or their lands that they occupy. I think that -- and how that would relate to other biological wildlife management data that's gathered at the same time of the -- and using both sources to come up with better proposals and better management of the resources, subsistence resources.

MR. OLSEN: What's the consensus on council? Would you like to set up some kind of workshop to go over some of these procedures?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: What kind of time frame are we talking about?

MR. CRATTY: June.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: It can't happen in June, not for me.

MR. CRATTY: When the sockeyes are ready.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That's why I'm asking, what kind of time frame.

MR. STOVALL: You could probably try and pick a time when all the council members would be able to get together either formally or informally. Possibly a situation where a presenter of some type of the traditional and environmental knowledge could be available or someone from NBS might come and talk about bear biology.

Someone of that nature, where you're getting involved with information that you really --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Would be like in Kodiak? Kodiak?

MR. OLSEN: I believe that's at the discretion of the council as to their wishes.

DR. MASON: I would really love to do something like a TEK -- traditional environmental knowledge seminar or something, and I would be especially delighted if it was in Kodiak. I would like a chance to get there. I would like to request if the council would like to do that right now, they wait until this round of proposal analysis gets through. I also will be involved in very frantic proposals for the next few months.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you, Rachel.

MR. KNAUER: One possibility that needs to be discussed is tying it to their fall meeting next fall. So, have a day or a part of a day at the start of the meeting for some of this traditional training. That would not necessitate, then, a separate trip or meeting somewhere that might interrupt some of your other activities.

MR. OLSEN: As we always go into our fall meetings, hopefully, being prepared, what would be the conflict with our spring meeting, February?

MR. KNAUER: That's what Rachel was mentioning as far as the individuals that would be involved in preparation of the materials and the presentation are going to be frantically trying to prepare the analyses of these proposals so that would be very difficult to accomplish by your February meeting.

MR. STOVALL: Possibly after --

DR. MASON: After it would be a good time.

MR. OLSEN: I wasn't quite sure which meeting you were talking about. Whether we were trying to get the proposals together before the February board meeting or November or -- maybe I misunderstood.

DR. MASON: Before the February council meetings is what I was referring to.

MR. OLSEN: I was associating our proposals now to be presented to the board meeting this November. This has cleared me.

MR. STOVALL: November board meeting won't deal with what we've been discussing at this meeting. The proposals for change and things of that meeting will be discussed in the April, 1996 board meeting, which is after our next council meeting.

MR. OLSEN: Certainly, then is what I hear, it's possible to incorporate this, then, to follow or be a part of our next regional meeting?

MR. KNAUER: Your next regional meeting is February. That's when you debate all of the proposals that are going to affect your region. And the -- your technical staff is going to be really involved between now and then. And what they are suggesting is either a separate meeting sometime after February, and that would depend a lot on budgetary considerations. The other thing would be to have it in your next fall meeting, an extra day or half a day there for them to make presentations to you and also provide something for you to take back at the same time.

MR. OLSEN: Al, do you have a question?

MR. CRATTY: No.

MR. OLSEN: Is that agreeable at this point?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Would that be like Gilda and Vincent, if we're talking about -- of course, we haven't set up a date, we're talking two meetings already. We haven't even set up a place or time for that. So, if you're asking if it's agreeable, if we haven't even set up a place or time for our fall meeting which is two meetings from now --

MR. EVERITT: Let's bring it back up at the spring meeting and decide if we want to have a class in the fall.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That's what I'm saying. We haven't decided where our next meeting's going to be, much less two meetings from now. See what I'm saying?

MR. OLSEN: I certainly do, but irregardless of when or where the meeting is --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: It sounds good to me, but like Rachel's mentioning, Kodiak would be great, we don't even know if two meetings from now we're going to be in Kodiak.

DR. MASON: You could approve of the idea in concept and not make any --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: In concept, and decide when that comes up. In concept that would be fine with me.

MR. OLSEN: That would be acceptable, as far as I'm concerned, revisit it in the spring meeting.

The next item, who can give us any information on that.

MR. STOVALL: I have. In the information I provided to all the council members just before we got here, there is an update on the compacting and co-management that is going on in the state, just informational purposes. I'm not sure. I don't know of any compacting that is going on in our region.

DR. MASON: I didn't prepare anything for this. I don't know what's going on.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you. And, yes, I realize it's been an ongoing discussion for quite some time. Especially about co-management, but I guess that brings us to fisheries. I guess I don't know what the intent was under fisheries. Would you enlighten

me on that?

MR. STOVALL: I'm going to defer that to Bill.

MR. KNAUER: I think you've already gotten all the information on that. You've heard in other discussions the status of the Katie John case and the NARC petition which relate to that, and the fact that the board is not -- because of the uncertainty of those two things, the board is not accepting proposals related to that at this time, but when and if the federal program becomes actively involved, we can guarantee that the councils will be provided adequate opportunity to be involved themselves in that. We recognize the importance of fish in the subsistence lifestyle, and we also recognize the importance of fish as a commercial part of your lifestyle also.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you. I guess we were drifting off course in covering some of these ahead of time. I believe that we are all comfortable with any discussion we had pertaining to the fisheries?

MR. CRATTY: Uh-huh.

MR. EVERITT: Let's move on.

MR. OLSEN: That goes on to Joint Federal Research Management Planning Summary. Do I hear a voice of wisdom?

DR. MASON: I never heard of it.

MR. WILLIS: I have no idea what that is.

MR. KNAUER: Me neither.

MR. EVERITT: Let's go right on.

MR. STOVALL: I don't know if it's not in the booklet

--

MR. EVERITT: Moses was filling the page.

DR. MASON: Maybe he knows about something we don't.

MR. OLSEN: Certainly, I hope in the future, we'll find out. I feel my own self we have discussed it, I'd rather have it as proceed not from my own point of view.

I believe we did go on our annual report that we had here. What was the action that was being sought here as to accepting the annual report or changes to it or its --

MR. STOVALL: What I was able to gather from the council when we discussed it was that there was an interest in changes -- putting issues and concerns first in it and then we went and listed some issues and concerns, and the annual report would be developed from that information. We did skip over the information exchange staff and public, but there's no public here right now, and if the staff has anything in addition they want to add, my only concern is to assure that refuge resources, any proposals, all the refuge resources are used and keep in close contact with the refuge land managers.

MR. OLSEN: On this annual report, is just a basic consensus enough, or do you think they require some more issue motions? I don't see where they need a motion --

MR. EVERITT: I think we covered it yesterday, gave them the information we wanted.

MR. OLSEN: We never did give a definite "yes." This is the consensus of the council that we would like to see more dialogue than statistics. I think that was the --

MR. STOVALL: I'm not well versed in parliamentary procedure. I understand what you're saying. I don't know if --

MR. KNAUER: I don't think -- in my personal opinion,

I see no need for a special motion for it. In my mind, the council has expressed its desires; in hearing the discussion Robert understood your desires. To me, that's -- that accomplishes it.

MR. OLSEN: Just expecting to keep them up.

DR. MASON: The agenda said what to focus on with the annual report. The council determined what to focus on. I think that sums it up.

MR. STOVALL: I guess I might add that if there are any additional issues and concerns after last night's thinkings and whatever, go ahead and let me know what they are and I'll add them to the list.

MR. OLSEN: Well, I think that brings us to 9, establishment of time and place of the next meeting. Do I hear --

MR. EVERITT: Shall we meet in Anchorage or Kodiak?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I would like that.

Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask if we do meet in Anchorage, would that help -- would more input from different people, from like the staff, at least -- I note that we tried to come down here so we can get more input from this area, and obviously, you know, we're not hardly getting anything. But -- like if we're up in Anchorage, I noticed we had quite a few people not necessarily from the public, but at least from different parts of the -- from different aspects of the government's offices, you know, you know, that that helped us, at least -- at least helped the council. I know we've tried to do our best -- we had a lot of input in our trip to Old Harbor. This one here, I guess, obviously, didn't pan out too well, but we could try Kodiak, but what I'm wondering is would it be cheaper to fly us all to Anchorage? Most of us are real close to Kodiak. That would be good too. It doesn't matter to me. But Anchorage would be just as fine. I'm just kind of curious as to what would be more beneficial to the council or itself, you know.

MR. OLSEN: That has been my experience that most of our staff and staff resource is home-based out of Anchorage, as well as the office, and I do certainly take that into consideration at some of our meetings so as to help us along.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'm kind of leaning towards Anchorage myself. I thought we've got quite a bit of information from -- and if that -- for budgetary reasons, maybe possibly that might be best, I don't know.

MR. OLSEN: Rachel.

DR. MASON: Okay. There's obviously advantages and disadvantages to meeting both in small rural communities and in Anchorage, you saw at the meeting in Anchorage that the full complement of fish and game people, Randy was saying, APIA could be there, even members of the public that are from this region, that happen to be in those meetings. The benefit of coming to a small rural community is it is coming right to the people and there's more of an opportunity for local input. It's at a price of a lot of travel arrangements and accommodations. So, it seems to me that it would be appropriate to -- we've done the small rural one this time, Anchorage would be an opportunity to get the advantages of other agency people to come. Fish and Game couldn't make it to this one. A lot more staff could make it if it was in Anchorage.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: This has been a really pretty quiet complement here, you know.

MR. KNAUER: The chairman of Southeast expressed some



feelings, and I -- I don't know whether you all know, I go -- I'm responsible for helping all of the councils, so I try and rotate around to various councils. What you've experienced here is not unusual. You can go into a very small community where subsistence is a very high priority and there may be one or two people show up or three or four. That's the most common. The situation you had in, I believe, Old Harbor where there were a large number of people, that's pretty unusual. And it doesn't seem to me -- there seems to be no real rhyme or reason because there will be notices posted at the grocery and at the Post Office and maybe on the local radio or CB, and the chairman of the Southeast region said -- I can't express it with the eloquence that he did, but he said, we are making the effort and it is the responsibility of the community and the individuals out there then to also make the effort. The council members are taking the time and responsibility to represent their people and their region and they are doing the best they can. I think that's the way it is with you folks. Where you want to meet, I think, you're doing a good job, sort of rotating it between the small community where there is the opportunity and the larger community whether it's Anchorage or Kodiak, where there is more staff support, but it is at your choice where you choose to be. We will -- we will provide the technical support that you need to meet wherever you choose.

MR. OLSEN: I know you're talking about Bill Thompson. I do envy his way with words and his vocabulary without a doubt.

MR. STOVALL: I don't know if it's my place or not. I think you're doing both of those elk and brown bear on Kodiak and gaming for your next meeting, it might be a good idea to try and have it in Kodiak, because you may have quite a bit of public input when you start talking about brown bears and elk on Kodiak Island. You're also going to probably get a lot of testimony from the State too. So, I suggest -- this is just a suggestion -- but you'll get testimony from the State on it whether you're in Anchorage or Kodiak. But public comment would probably be very interested in it once they found out that there's a proposal for subsistence harvest of bear and/or elk.

MR. OLSEN: I say that I tend to agree with Mr. Stovall here. We would be representing the elk and bear best, and giving the opportunity of the people that have with the past proposals. I believe the majority of these proposals were from people of Kodiak Island.

MR. EVERITT: Let's have the meeting in Kodiak in February then.

MR. CRATTY: I second.

MR. KNAUER: You have a calendar in your book that shows when the window for your meeting starts and the meeting ends, you may wish to address that as to the time or dates.

DR. MASON: Theirs have been chosen.

MR. KNAUER: There are two meetings that already have been scheduled that impact when you schedule. The reason they impact is because your team members, Rachel and Robert, also support those two councils.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, now, if it's -- haven't had too much opposition of having the meeting in Kodiak, what dates are we talking about?

MR. OLSEN: That's what we're looking at here.

MR. KNAUER: The window opens January 29th, and

essentially closes March 1st. The thing to consider is this week there is a Southcentral meeting and a Southeast meeting, so you would not wish --

MR. EVERITT: 16th of February. 15th and 16th.

MR. LUKIN: That's my daughter's birthday.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: How about the 1st and 2?

DR. MASON: Here we go.

MR. OLSEN: 1st and 2nd.

MR. EVERITT: That's fine. 1st and 2nd.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I would rather 1st and 2nd, personally.

MR. EVERITT: In Kodiak.

MR. OLSEN: I, myself, I think -- I have no objection to that. I just want to let you know my feelings, a lot of times I will purposefully try to hold the meeting after the Southeast region's that a lot of times there might be other information available that has come through their meetings that might help us along our process too. So, with that just in mind, is there any comment? I certainly am agreeable to most any day that fits the council's meetings.

MR. CRATTY: 22nd, 23rd?

MR. OLSEN: Is there any conflict or any objection?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: No conflict with me.

MR. CRATTY: How about you, Tom?

MR. EVERITT: Just fine.

MR. STOVALL: Moses wanted me to suggest that you have the meeting earlier in the week.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Earlier in the week or earlier in the month? What is his purpose?

MR. WILLIS: Getting our staff in and trying to get back on Friday, sometimes it's harder to make arrangements on Friday or Saturday.

MR. KNAUER: There are sometimes problems with some of the -- some of the airlines tend to reduce their schedules on weekends.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'm pretty flexible. The only thing I'd like to say is I'd rather have it on Monday or Tuesday or Thursday or Friday, because some of us hold jobs. If you tie them in with the weekend, rather than break up the week, just like I was mentioning the last time, remember. You hate to have it in the middle of the week because it's hard to work on a Monday, go to a meeting and try to work on Friday. I'd rather have it the first part of the week or the end of the week. I'm pretty flexible.

MR. OLSEN: These holidays that come in February, how does that affect your workweek?

MR. KNAUER: We will provide support whenever your council wishes to meet.

MR. EVERITT: It's called comp time.

MR. KNAUER: If you wish to meet then, we will be there and provide support for you.

MR. CRATTY: Is that for conflicts on your end?

MR. KNAUER: We would just end up taking another day off sometime. But whenever you folks wish to meet, we'll be there and provide support.

MR. WILLIS: We can't speak for the other agency people as far as how they -- we can't speak to other agency people as

to what they might do. That may be another consideration.

MR. CRATTY: Let's go the 26th and 27th.

MR. OLSEN: That is beyond all -- as I see it, just due to many agencies and their holiday calendars, I would -- yes, I would recommend either the 26th or 27th --

MR. EVERITT: Let's do it the 26th and 27th and be done with it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: One thing I'd like to stress, just to throw on the table, just for the council to think about, whatever we decide on this one here, when we come to our fall meeting, I'd kind of like to not have it around October 4th anymore, because that's boating day. I've had an absentee once. This last time I missed it just because I took off. I forgot to get an absentee ballot. October 4th is a boating for -- I just want to throw that on the table for our meeting after this. I'd like to not have it too close to that date.

MR. KNAUER: At your next meeting, we'll also provide you a calendar to look at. We're trying to get the procedures down to find out what we need to make your work a little smoother.

MR. OLSEN: Consensus seems to be to set our meeting date for February 26th and 27th in Kodiak. Does this need a motion?

MR. STOVALL: No. Consensus is fine.

MR. KNAUER: Consensus is fine.

MR. OLSEN: I see we have no public comment.

MR. OLSEN: Staff, council comments?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Just in time for our adjournment, Della.

MR. CRATTY: I have a comment. I'm really enjoying this. I'll try to get back. I enjoyed working with everybody. I learned a lot.

MR. OLSEN: It takes a little time to get into the focus of what we're trying to accomplish and the tools and means that we have to work with. I certainly enjoy it. As for myself, I would like to make a comment that I know that the staff puts in a lot of effort to make these meetings possible. I just want to make mention, it certainly does not go unnoticed. We appreciate all the help, as it is a big task. If we did not have help supporting us, we would find it very difficult. I would like to thank everyone on the staff that your work is noticed.

Any more comments? I see we have --

A SPEAKER: I just kind of maybe as a thought, I know I didn't get the agenda and anything proposed, I'm not sure what the process is. I know the meeting right now the timing was kind of bad.

There's an awful lot of people out of town that probably would have liked to have participated in this. I'm not sure what we can do here for the communities out here, to let people to know what's going on with this council.

MR. OLSEN: This is certainly a concern, and I have addressed it to where we're wondering where we're missing the boat. This is what we encourage and try to do is to reach out to the communities and their feedback from the people is what makes our council succeed. As to the best of my knowledge, we have tried advertising by paper, by radio, and even word of mouth, and we are certainly open to any suggestions that might be healthier for obtaining more public comment.

A SPEAKER: We send our newsletter quarterly. We can

mail some of that stuff out locally.

MR. OLSEN: Certainly, I feel that by giving a request as to having mailout to whoever might be the best or whoever it might be, city council, tribal council, these are things that if you could just request they be put on an agenda mailout, I think that --

A SPEAKER: I think so. I've not really been -- except seeing the last set of minutes, I wasn't really aware of what this board was doing. That's where I picked it up, except to know that you were there. I never really seen anything, any paper myself in the corporation office, in the tribal council and directly -- not directly involved, but the city and bureau office is right down the hall. We usually share a lot of our paperwork.

MR. STOVALL: I will take partial blame for not getting you folks, at least, more information about the meeting. I guess we had the agenda together awhile back and that probably could have been sent to you a lot sooner; and I wasn't able to reach one of your -- one of the council members that's from near this area and -- which was another avenue to get the information out. The posters that were developed didn't get to me until this week; and in the future, if we could get the posters out at a very minimum that describes the information that's going to be discussed, a minimum of a month ahead of time so they could be put up all around town. There might be a little bit better turnout at the meetings. I'll have to take most of the blame for not getting that word out more effectively here.

MR. OLSEN: I would just like to add that two of our council members from outlying villages of the immediate area that had basically put in the request to come down and visit your community, neither one of them had -- were able to attend this meeting; and I know, as for myself, I had hoped that they might have done a little bit more of their homework. Word of mouth seems to be one of the strongest points in the smaller communities. I know I had depended on at least one or both of them to help us out on how to reach people. Excuse is not a reason, I understand.

A SPEAKER: We're glad you made it anyway.

DR. MASON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to thank Della for -- at such short notice for putting up those agendas around town. When we got here, I noticed they were posted all over the place, and also just thank the community of King Cove for hosting us.

A SPEAKER: I wish -- the timing was kind of bad for all of us. If you ever do it again, we'll be a little bit better prepared.

DR. MASON: The members of the community that participated were very strong participants.

MR. OLSEN: One thing as with the posters that go out, I think the question that was asked me, "Is this a public meeting?" We might want to put in bold meetings to really affirm to the people this is a public meeting.

A SPEAKER: I noticed on the agenda, there's one part, open to the public, kind of looks like just that one part is open to the public. I don't know --

MR. OLSEN: Public comment.

MR. OLSEN: This is just an error, human. These are the things that we are trying to assess and resolve.

A SPEAKER: I think that's fine. I'm glad you guys made it. Next time, if you ever do it again --

MR. OLSEN: Just for your own knowledge, we have discussed and hopefully are putting a proposal to at least get a subsistence hunt for the Izembek caribou herd.

A SPEAKER: That's a major issue here.

MR. OLSEN: A major issue in this area. It has been addressed quite lengthy.

A SPEAKER: I'm sorry to miss this. You guys are getting ready to close. Is that it?

MR. OLSEN: Yes. Certainly. You're not -- feel free to --

A SPEAKER: I was talking to Randy a little bit, and he said you had -- what was it -- some kind of -- where if a person can hunt that somebody else can hunt for them.

MR. STOVALL: Designated hunter.

A SPEAKER: Do they have that out here or just in Kodiak?

MR. STOVALL: Just in Kodiak, just for deer in Kodiak, if that's an interest --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Excuse me. That's okay. I'm sorry.

I was just going to say that doesn't mean that can't be brought up and proposed down here. I think that that would be a good -- a big concern.

A SPEAKER: There's a lot of families here that have people hunt for them, and some elderly people. I know I brought it up before with Fish and Wildlife on why they don't let people do that.

MR. OLSEN: I feel that, yes, these are the things we need to hear from the people. We feel that we should not make a proposal for people of a different area. We try to be conservative in that, and that's all it takes is a request, basically, from the people or a person of the area, and there we have the staff and the tools to put it in a format that would be acceptable for presentation as a proposal. So, please don't have the fear that the proposal might be difficult. There's a lot of help to help anyone through it.

A SPEAKER: I think I'd like to request -- I think a lot of people don't have folks to go and do this. Sometimes when you do have somebody that is, it helps people here.

MR. OLSEN: Yes, and as far as I know, the gentleman that we had discussed this with, he is going to get together with us in the next couple of weeks, hopefully we'll make it before the deadline for this year. Designated hunter, excuse me, that is not.

A SPEAKER: Maybe a request to discuss it on the next agenda. I don't know.

DR. MASON: You could do that. You could also put in another proposal in addition to the one that the other gentleman is putting together, one for a designated hunter. We've got some proposal forms. I think Bill is going to get one.

MR. CRATTY: Robert has had in his notes, designated hunters for duck hunters, I just added "and big game." I'm not sure caribou and moose are the only major big-game species. And I don't know -- caribou season is closed at present?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Chair, not to put a damper on this here, but didn't we kind of talk about ducks being kind of -- designated hunters because they were migratory, it would be kind of tough to work out?

MR. STOVALL: It was just identified as an issue and

concern.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: This is an issue. We talked about that yesterday.

MR. OLSEN: Good morning.

A SPEAKER: Good morning.

MR. OLSEN: We went ahead with our meeting here this morning, but we -- you caught us here just before -- on just prior to our adjournment. We are here, and we would certainly like to hear what's on your mind.

A SPEAKER: Yes, we'd -- if you don't mind. This is my wife, Bertha. Everybody here --

A SPEAKER: This here pertains to this proposal form that was handed out, and I was wondering how you go about -- this proposal being filled out and you guys having access to it. How is that processed? If I went ahead and filled this out, which I just did on a dummy copy, how would I know that you, the advisory board, got ahold of it?

MR. EVERITT: Isn't there an address on it, where to send it? Send it to that address, and it goes to the board.

MR. OLSEN: We can accept it. We can accept it here. What we intend to do is to put a proposal together that is in an acceptable format that has a better chance of being accepted, and we certainly -- I certainly don't want to discourage anybody because they are not familiar with the process. That is what we are all here for.

MR. STOVALL: Let me -- maybe I could clarify that for you. When you fill out your proposal form there, make sure that you have as much information as you could possibly get on it and be very specific, and then that will be sent to the office where an analysis will be done on it and it will be given back to the regional council here for the February meeting, and they will then look at your proposal and decide whether they want to endorse it or not, and make any changes to it so that the proposal has a good chance of passing at the subsistence board meeting in April of next year. So, that's kind of how the process works. You need to make sure that -- like I said, very specific and -- as to what you want and you can either give it to us now, if you think it's ready, or make sure that it gets to the regional office, the address that's on the form there, by October 27th.

A SPEAKER: I'm just -- we're just going to put it to you the way we think and whatever, and that -- you know, it's not going to go right down, but -- if you people can help us along here, it's the first time we ever done it, so, if there's any mistakes in there, we appreciate it, just try to go along.

MR. OLSEN: I would certainly hope that you leave contact numbers of whatever the person submitting the original proposal is so that if there's any question we might be able to contact you by phone or fax to clarify the intent.

A SPEAKER: You mind if we go over this like -- go over this here, this is what she came up with it.

MR. KNAUER: Bill, I was going to say you may want to -- wish to have a short recess and work with them helping them out right now rather than trying to get it all on the record.

MR. OLSEN: Yes. Thank you for that point, Bill. I guess that would be in order. We'll call for a recess.

MR. EVERITT: Or should we just adjourn and help them.

I think we can adjourn and help them and send it.

MR. OLSEN: That's -- I don't see any conflict there.

MR. EVERITT: I call for adjournment.

MR. OLSEN: It's been moved for adjournment. Do I  
hear a second?

MR. CRATTY: Second.

MR. OLSEN: Moved and seconded. The meeting is  
adjourned.

(Whereupon the council meeting  
was concluded at 10:50 a.m.)

I, Sandra M. Mierop, a Registered Professional Reporter, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that the subsistence council hearing was taken down in shorthand by me, later reduced to typewriting under my direction as a true and correct record of the proceedings

I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any of the parties in which this hearing is taken and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any person employed by the parties hereto, or financially interested in the action.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE on this the 13th day of October, 1995.

Notary Public in and for  
the State of Texas